

# CALUMNY DISPLAY'D:

O R,

*Pseudo-Philo-Buchananus* couch'd of a Cataract,

BEING

*A modest and impartial Reply*

TO

An impudent and malicious Libel,

INTITUL'D,

*A Letter to a Gentleman in Edinburgh, &c.*

WHEREIN

Doctor Johnston is vindicated, and critical Remarks upon  
*Buchanan's* Paraphrase of the Psalms are offered.

---

*He that is FIRST in his own cause seemeth just, but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him.*

Prov. cap. xviii. 17.

*Answer not a FOOL according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him.*

*Answer a FOOL according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceits.*

Ibid. cap. xvi. 4. D

*Que loquor infelix, INTER RES adulterat EFFRONS;*

*Dum coquit hostiles MENS SCCELERATA dolos.*

1<sup>ST</sup>. Psal. lvi. 2

*Parturit hic noxam, sterili sed credidit arvo*

*Semina, nec præter somnia vana metet.*

Id. Psal. vii. 14.

---

EDINBURGH, Printed in the Year M. DCC. XII

10

CALUMNY DISSEMINATED

O. E.

Psyche-Trip-Buchanan couch of a Catarrh

BEING

A model and important

TO

An impudent and malicious Libel

IN THE



Doctor Buchanan is a very learned and able man, and his office is on Buchanan's fragments of the Libels and others.

The Libel is a very new and original work, and is a very good one.

The Libel is a very new and original work, and is a very good one.

The Libel is a very new and original work, and is a very good one.

The Libel is a very new and original work, and is a very good one.

EDINBURGH: Printed by W. D. D. D.





# Calumny Display'd:

O R,

## *Pseudo-Philo-Buchananus*

Couch'd of a Cataract, &c.

**A** Pamphlet having been some few Days ago printed in this Place, intituled, *A Letter to a Gentleman in Edinburgh, &c.* in which the Publisher of a late Edition of Doctor *Arthur Johnston's* Paraphrase of the Psalms in *Latin Verse*, is charged with having used a great deal of Freedom in his Preface and Notes, with the Schoolmasters of this Nation, in treating them with very abusive and scurrilous Language; as also, with having past the most audacious and calumnious Censure upon *Buchanan's* Paraphrase, that possibly it has met with since the Days of *Ludovicus Crucius*, a *Portuguese* Jesuite: The Publisher therefore, in order to vindicate himself, and, at the same Time, to undeceive the Publick, takes this Opportunity to assure the World, That in all his Notes on that Book, the School-masters of this Kingdom are not so much as once mentioned; and, when the Remarker shows the contrary, the Publisher hereby assures him he will then, but not till then, submit to the Accusation, and own the Charge. And whether he has used them unhandsomely in his Preface or not,

as also, whether he has passed such an audacious and calumnious Censure upon *Buchanan's* Paraphrase as is alledged, the Publisher is willing to submit to the Judgment of every impartial Reader, for which he desires to appeal to the Preface itself. The Remarker also is pleased confidently to affirm, That the Publisher is for banishing *Buchanan* from our Schools and Universities altogether, a thing, which, as he could not but know, would, in all Probability, be morally impossible; so he here declares solemnly, it never once entred into his Head. The Publisher indeed frankly confesses, that these several Years bypast, he has been of Opinion (founded on his own repeated Experience, as well as the Remonstrance of others) that the School-boys in this Place, have been generally too soon entred into *Buchanan's* Paraphrase of the Psalms, and therefore would have been extremely willing that some proper Expedient might have been sals upon to remove that Inconveniency; and having lately published an Edition of Dr. *Johnston's* Paraphrase of the Psalms, with some other sacred Pieces in *Latin* Verse, he judged it proper, by the Advice of several good Friends, and learned Acquaintances, to apply to the General Assembly of this Church in *May* last, for their Recommendation, for teaching Dr. *Johnston's* Paraphrase of the Psalms, and the Reverend Mr. *Robert Boyd* of *Trochrig* his *Flecatombe Christiana*, in the Grammar Schools of this Kingdom, as an intermediate sacred Lesson betwixt *Castalio's* Dialogues and *Buchanan's* Paraphrase: The Transition from the easy Prose of the one, to the difficult Verse of the other, being by many judged both too great and sudden at once to be entirely approved of, though hitherto the common Practice in most Schools of the Kingdom. The Publisher's Petition was so far regarded by the Assembly, as to be referred to a Committee (which was all that was asked by the Petitioner) of ten or twelve of the most eminent and worthy Ministers of this Church, most of them Principals of Colleges, and Professors of Divinity in Universities. 'Tis true indeed, some Objections, occasioned thro' a Mistake of the Petition, were moved against it in the Assembly; but they were all solidly answered by some Learned and Reverend Members. The Committee met accordingly, and drew up a very favourable Report, which was read in the Commission, at their last Sederunt; and, in all Probability, it would have been approved of and past, but, for want of a *Quorum*, it was ordered to be record.



recorded in the proper Books or Minutes of Procedure, to be discussed by the next Commission in *August* first. And this is a true Account or Narrative of the whole Affair, notwithstanding the contemptible, ridiculous and false Light the Remarker is pleased to dress it in, merely we suppose for want of due Information; for we can't persuade our selves, that a Gentleman of the Remarker's pretended Candour and Integrity would willingly falsify; though indeed we cannot fail to notice here, That we humbly conceive it would have conduced much more to the Remarker's Honour, either to have let alone his Remarks altogether, or, at least to have delayed them so long, until having made himself Master of a Copy of the Petition, (for what Rastiness was it, pray, to write against a Petition, which he confesses he never saw, and concerning which he has received but very lame and imperfect, not to say absolutely false Information?) he might have narrated Facts more impartially, and consequently might have secured himself from lying open to such sharp and severe Thrusts as his Misinformations, or, to take off the Vizard, and speak more properly, his Injustice and Malice may expose him to, provided his Adversaries have a mind to push their Advantage against him to the utmost. The Remarker is next pleased to notice, That it would not have redounded much to the Honour of that Court, had any such Order or Recommendation past: However the Publisher humbly conceives, That that Reverend Court, in all Probability, will not allow that Gentleman's Notions of Honour to be looked on as an infallible Standard, nor yet make his Sentiments the Rule of their Procedure. What the Publisher therefore proposes to do at present, shall be confined to a Vindication of the Doctor's Paraphrase of the Psalms from such Objections as have been offered against it by the Remarker; as also, by Way of Reprisals, to present to the View of the Publick such Phrases or Expressions occurring in *Buchanan's* Paraphrase, as have been taken notice of and censured by Criticks; which, 'tis hoped will easily counter-balance whatever has been objected against the Doctor: For which Practice, however, the Publisher earnestly desires to hope, that as well the illustrious and venerable Shade of his incomparable Countryman, as all his Admirers every where, (I mean who are really such, not counterfeited and pretended ones) will readily grant him Quarter, now he is acting in Self-defence, which is always sustained as a good Plea. In the *next*  
Place

Place, he shall offer somewhat in defence of Professors *Steuart* and *Ker*, whose Judgment the Remarker would have set aside altogether, the first as not competent, (O consummate Impudence! that Gentleman being able to teach the Remarker the Sense of *Buchanan* and *Johnston* too) the other as being too much interested in the Matter, that his Opinion should be relied upon; and, in the *last* Place, shall subjoin by way of Appendix, a Copy of his Petition presented to the late General Assembly in *May* last, together with the Report of the Committee, appointed by the Assembly to take the foresaid Petition under Consideration, as also the Certificate the Remarker is so fond to have produced (tho' it appears more for his Conviction than Satisfaction) under the Hands of Professors *Steuart* and *Ker*, and Mr. *Ruddiman*; which clearly and distinctly exhibits the Opinion of these learned Gentlemen with regard to the Expediency of the Doctor's Psalms being introduced into and taught in the lower Classes at Grammar Schools, previously to *Buchanan's* Paraphrase in the higher Classes, as being in their Judgment plainer and easier than it: From all which, the Publisher hopes, it will clearly appear, whether he entertained any such Design as is charged upon him by the Remarker, *viz.* of banishing *Buchanan* altogether out of Schools and Universities, or not; as also, whether the Publisher falsely assumed or usurped in his Preface, Mr. *Ruddiman's* Testimony in the Matter in Question or not, as is no less impudently and maliciously, than falsely and groundlessly charged by the Remarker in the Conclusion of his scurrilous and nonsensical Libel. And as to what relates further to the Publisher's Vindication, as being less material to the Publick, though very material to himself, shall be deferred to another Opportunity; when the Publisher hopes he shall be able to vindicate his Meaning from such false and ridiculous Glosses as have been put upon it, by exposing the gross Ignorance or unaccountable Malice (if not a Complication of both) in the Remarker's so scandalously perverting the evident and manifest Sense of some Passages in his Preface, by a most Jesuitical and shifting, nay nonsensical and unintelligible Interpretation, or Depravation rather; whereby he would hope, if it be possible, that *Philo-Buchananus* may at last be effectually couched of a Cataract, and have his visual Organs purged as with *Euphrasy* or *Eyebright*, provided the thick Slough, or *Gutta serena* obduced over them, is not thoroughly incorporated, as well into his mental



tal as corporal Constitution, which Time alone will discover. In the mean time I would have *Philo-Buchananus* to ruminate on the Observation of his Friend *Horace*, which 'tis not impossible ere long he may actually find verified in *propria personâ*,

— *Fragili quarens illidere dentem*  
— *Offendet solido*, —

At present having to do not with the passive good natured old Gentleman, *Doctissime Trottere*, Schoolmaster of *Drumfries*, but with one subject to like Passions with himself, Guile and Malice only excepted, and consequently sensible of an Affront, especially when first offered, as in the present Case: But of this probably more afterwards. So at present, dropping my own Vindication, and proper Answers to all the Mistakes, Injuries and Calumnies contained in the Remarkers first twelve Pages, I shall proceed to p. 13. where he begins his bloody Attack on the learned and celebrated Dr. *Johnston*, that great Ornament of his Country, and shall offer the best Defence I can.

In this 13th Page he proceeds to examine the Publisher's Arguments for introducing into the Schools Dr. *Johnston's* Paraphrase, not *instead* of *Buchanan's*, as he still unjustly and maliciously affirms, but to be read in the lower Classes previously to *Buchanan* in the higher Classes, which are these three, " The exquisite Beauty " and Purity of *Johnston's* Verse, Its truly admirable Simplicity " and Easiness, and His closely copying the original *Hebrew*."

As to the Purity of *Johnston's* Diction he excepts against five Words, *fulcivit*, *plecto* for *punio*, *reus* in the Sense of *guilty*, *techna*, and *bilanx* as wanting classical Authority.

As to *fulcivit*, Psal. xl. i. *Spe mihi non vana mentem fulcivit*, he asks Authority for it. Perhaps indeed neither he nor I, from the small Collection of Books we are Masters of, can show Authority altogether unexceptionable, yet I incline much to think, that such a correct Writer as Dr. *Johnston* would not have used it without Authority. To suppose this is at least more modest, than dogmatically to affirm, as the Remarker doth, that *there is none, nor ever was*. Has he or I seen all the antient *Latin* Authors, even those extant? and are not a great many lost, not now to be seen? Besides, can every Person in every Tense of every Verb, be found all expressly exemplified in the best classical Authors? Doth not the Analogy

nalogy, according to the general Rule, in a great many Words ge-  
 nerally satisfy? I am the more confirmed in my Supposition, when  
 I consider that all Grammarians tell us, that the most of those Verbs  
 of the fourth Conjugation which form their Preterite and Supine in  
 an irregular Manner, they observe, from good Authors, sometimes to  
 be formed regularly, according to the general Rule of the fourth Con-  
 jugation, *ivi, itum*; thus they tell us that we read *sancivi* or *sanc-  
 iiv, sancitum*, as well as *saxi, sanctum*; *haurivi* or *hauriiv, hauri-  
 ritum*, as well as *hausi, haustum* or *hausum*; *salvi* and *salvi, sepi-  
 vi, sepii* and *sepsi*; *cambiivi* and *campsi*, &c. In short there seems  
 to have been a promiscuous Flexion of Verbs of the fourth Conjugati-  
 on, so that it is not easy to determine all the just Exceptions from the  
 general Rule, and to ascertain the precise Number of the Irregulars;  
 and some of those Irregulars which Grammarians adduce, such as  
*campsi*, are not well vouched. Don't the old Grammarians, *Pro-  
 bus, Phocas, Diomedes* and *Priscian*, tell us, that all the Verbs  
 of this Conjugation form either *ivi* or *ii*, but some of them the one  
 more usually than the other; so that *Burman's* Note on *Ovid*, Ep.  
 ix. 18. *Hercule supposito sidera fulsit Atlas*, is not so ridiculous  
 as the Remarker would represent it, when that learned Critick says,  
 That, instead of *fulsit*, any who likes not that Word may read *ful-  
 cit*, for *fulciit* or *fulcivit*; so it is plain the Word *fulcivit* was  
 not exceptionable in *Burman's* Opinion, or disagreeable to his Ears,  
 and he is well enough warranted to express himself as he hath done  
 of *fulcit*, in the same Manner as *Virgil*, ix. *Æn.* 418. uses *it* for *iit*,  
 and that for *ivit*, *Et hasta Tago per tempus utrumque*. But then  
 I acknowledge, that the Syllable *it* thus contracted is always used  
 long by the Poets, not short, as it behoved to be in the foresaid  
 Verse, *fulcit Atlas*. But is the Word *fulcivit* used by no other  
 Writers save *Johnston*? Yes indeed, and those of good Reputation  
 for Letters too. *Pagninus* in his Version of the Psalms, adopted  
 by *Leusden*, and the most learned Dr. *Hare* late Bishop of *Chiche-  
 ster*, Psal. xviii. 36. *Dextera tua fulcivit me*, *Mollerus* in his  
 Version, adopted by *Beza*, *ibid.* *Dextera tua fulcivit me*, and  
*Beza* himself in his own paraphrastick Version, *ibid.* *Meque dex-  
 terâ tuâ labentem pro ingenti benignitate tua fulcivisti*. See also  
 the Hebrew Lexicographers, *Buxtorf, Schindlerus*, &c. on those  
 Hebrew Words which they render by *fulcio*, where they constant-  
 ly



by use *fulcivi* in the Preterite, and also *fulcitus*. Now, since so many learned Gentlemen have used the Word *fulcivit*, as well as Dr. *Johnston*, I leave it to the impartial Reader to judge, whether it is more probable that they have had Authority for it, or that they all blundered in conjugating a Verb of the fourth Conjugation, and therefore, if alive, should all be remitted to their Studies? If the Remarker still insist for express Authority, I ask him what Authority is there for the Verb *parturiit* used by *Buchanan*, Psal. vii. 14? Mr. *Ruddiman* tells us he can find none, *Gram. maj. part. i. p. 262.* so when the Remarker shows Authority for *Buchanan's parturiit* or *parturivit*, I shall show him Authority for *Johnston's fulcivit*.

As to *plecto* used for *punio*, Psal. xxxix. 11. since *Buchanan* uses it in the same Sense with *Johnston*, and so the Criticism falls equally on both, I pass it; but if this be a Fault, I see no good Reason why it should be more excusable in *Buchanan* than in *Johnston*. I say, if it be a Fault; for tho' I have the greatest Regard for Mr. *Ruddiman's* Opinion on this Head, and would not willingly differ from him, yea, for what appears to me as yet, his Opinion seems well founded, yet somewhat of a Doubt still sticks with me. The Reason of my Doubt is this, that *plecto* may not only be derived from *πλέω plico*, but from *πλάτω* or *πλάττω*, (whence *plectrum*) *percutio* which is frequently used with an Accusative, for *ferio* or *punio*, to strike or punish; may it not be probable that *plecto* in the Active might have been used too with some good classical Author, when *plector* is so frequently used for *punior* in the Passive? And not only the Authors of the *Nouvelle Methode* and other Grammarians, but both *Faber* and *R. Stephanus* in their *Thesauri* affirm it, and explain *plecto* the active Verb by *supplicio afficere*. *Stephanus* also explaining the Word expresses himself thus, *Isdem de causis alios plectere, & alios ne appellare quidem*. May not therefore the Active *plecto* be used for *punio*, since the Passive is so oft used for *punior*?

The third Word the Remarker excepts against is *reus*, taken by *Johnston* for *guilty*, Psal. v. 10. *Perde reos* — and in several other Places. 'Tis true that the Word *reus* is most frequently taken for one *impeached* or *accused*, whether guilty or innocent; but whether this be the proper Signification of the Word, as the Remarker affirms, is much to be doubted, for *reus dictus est à re quam promissit ac debet*, according to *Paulus*, and according to *Festus* is,

*qui causam dicit, or qui quid promisit, sponditve, ac debet.* And thus *reus* is sometimes used for the Plaintiff as well as the Defendant, for any one engaged in a Law-suit, *sive sit actor, sive cum eo actum est.* Vid. Festus in vocem contestari, *Contestari est cum uterque reus dicit, Testes estote.* Vid. Cic. de orat. ii. 183. *Reos autem appello non eos modò qui arguuntur, sed omnes quorum de re disceptatur; sic enim olim loquebantur.* The Word *reus* also signifies *one under an Engagement or Obligation*, whether by Vow, formal Stipulation, or naked Promise; thus *voti reus, reus stipulandi*, and *reus promittendi*, frequently used by Lawyers. But a principal Signification of the Word *reus*, in my humble Opinion, is the *Author of a real Action*, whether that Action be lawful or unlawful, virtuous or criminal; if the Action is unlawful, then *reus* is just the same as *guilty*. Thus *Plaut. Cistell. i. 3, 16. Quoniam reum ejus facti nescit qui siet.* Whoever looks into the Context will obviously find, that *reum ejus facti* here can by no Means signify one arraigned or impeached, but as all Commentators, *Lambin, Dousa, Gronovius, Taubman, R. Stephanus, &c.* explain it, the Author of this vile Action, the Person guilty of this Rape, who had made an Elopement, and whom the Person aggrieved did not know who he was, or where he was, so far was it from his being impeached. In this last named Sense I humbly think that Sentence is to be taken. *Cicero pro Ligar. i. 1. Habes confidentem reum.* There the Pannel owns that to be a real Fact which was charged against him, *viz.* his being in *Africk* at such a Time, but refuses this to be criminal; just as Lawyers with us say, I grant the Libel, but deny its Relevancy.

If the above Passage from *Plautus* does not satisfy our Remarker, as I'm sure it will every unbyassed Reader, that *reus* is sometimes used for *guilty*, or that he doth think *Plautus's* Authority not altogether sufficient, and since he challenges the Publisher to oblige him much in this, I shall endeavour to gain his Favour, by producing some other Passages out of unexceptionable Authors, which plainly prove it. *Phæd. IV. xxv. 22.*

*Sæpe impetravit veniam confessus reus,*

*Quanto innocenti justius debet dari?*

Here *reus* is plainly opposed to *innocenti*, and *Schefferus* and others explain *confessus reus*, a *Criminal convict*, or *manifestly guilty*. Thus *Ovid, Pont. II. ii. 56.*

*Non*



*Non est confessi causa tuenda rei.*

Et ibid. vi. 8.

*Aspera confesso verba remitte reo.*

Which Passages *Burman* explains thus, *Se Ovidius confessum reum vocat, non quod in judicio confessus esset culpam, sed quod manifestus reus erat, sibi delicti conscius, & ab omnibus pro reo convicto habitus: nunquam enim accusatus fuit, sed ab Augusto relegatus sine accusatione & judicio.* But a pregnant Instance is that, *Cic. Cat. i. 11. Leges quæ de civium reorum supplicio rogatæ sunt.* 'Tis in vain to elude the Force of this Testimony, as the Remarker doth, by preferring another Reading, *viz. Romanorum*, for *Grævius* not only supports the true Reading *civium reorum* from several MSS. but also confirms the same from plain Sense and Reason, in his judicious Note, *Leges civitatis non nisi de suorum civium suppliciis feruntur. Alienos lex civilis nec curat nec respicit.* INEPTÉ igitur hic legitur *civium Romanorum*: *Romanorum fuisset omittendum, ut in præcedentibus verbis, perniciosos cives morte multârunt, & in sequentibus, civium jura tenuerunt. Quos ante dixit cives perniciosos, hic appellat reos criminum, sc. capitalium.* Græv.

But in case the Remarker still decline *Cicero's* Authority, I shall next present him with Authority which I'm sure to him must be unexceptionable, and that is *Buchanan's*. The Passage I mean is in his *Detectio Mariæ*, in the very Title, *De Mariæ Scotorum Reginâ, totâque ejus contra Regem conjuratione, &c.* Item, *Actio contra Mariam, in qua ream & consciam esse eam hujus paricidii necessariis argumentis evincitur.* Can *ream* admit of any other Sense here but that of *guilty of*, or, as we Scots say, *Art and Part* in her Husband's Murder? were Arguments necessary only to prove that *Q. Mary* was arraigned?

*Grotius* also frequently in his excellent *Latin* Poems uses *reus* for *guilty*. In his *Eucharistia*, *Nam sinistros ordines Turba complebit reorum*; and in his *Sylva sacra*,

*An lethi reus est, si quis mendacia jurat?*

*Rea & cupiditas quæ sui nescit modum.*

*Qui se reos fatentur, & quos pœnitet.*

So that it is not the Publisher only that *Philo-Buchananus* challenges with his Cartel to combat him on this Point, but the *Manes* of

the great *Buchanan*, *Grotius*, *Grævius*, *Gronovius*, and other justly admired modern Writers. How came they all to be so bold as to use *reus* for *guilty*?

Add to all this, that the Christian Fathers, *Tertullian*, *Augustin*, &c. frequently use the Word *reus* for *guilty*, and the vulgate *Latin*, 1 Cor. xi. has *REUS erit corporis & sanguinis Domini*. Why might not *Johnston* then use it in this Sense in this sacred Poem, especially when it is considered, that none are arraigned at the divine Tribunal but those who are Criminals: And this may justify Divines in the frequent Use of *reus* in this Sense.

I come now to examine what Authority *Dr. Johnston* has for using the Words *techna* and *bilanx*, the fourth and fifth Words excepted against by the Remarker. *Techna* is used by *Terence*, *Eun.* IV. iv. 51. *Parmenonis tam scio hanc esse technam quam me vivere.* *Heaut.* III. i. 62. *Falli te sinas technis per servulum*, and by *Plautus*, *Most.* III. i. 23. and *Capt.* iii. iv. 110. *Bilanx* is not only used by *Mart. Capella*, ii. p. 42. but by some very learned Writers in their metrical Paraphrases of the Psalms. *Eobanus Heslus*, *Psal.* lxii. 10. *Si trutinæ dubio ponatur in orbe bilanciis*, and *Beza ibid.*

*Quod si in bilance quicquid est mortalium  
Cum vanitate appenderis.*

These are Moderns you'll say. It is true, but Moderns of great Reputation for Letters, and such as *Janus Broukhusius* thought fit to cite together with *Buchanan* for illustrating *Tibullus*; but I find *bilanx* used by an antient anonymous *Latin* Poet, whom I conjecture, from the Manner of writing, to have either been *Ausonius*, who lived before *Capella*, or some Contemporary of his. The Poem may challenge a Place here, not only for the Authority of *bilanx*, but also for the Phrase *percutit reos*, taken for *guilty*, and chiefly for the Subject.

*Elegans Dialogismus de Justitia.*

*Quæ Dea? Justitia. At cur torvo lumine spectas?*

*Nescia sum flecti, nec moveor pretio.*

*Unde genus? Cælo. Qui te genuere parentes?*

*Mi Modus est genitor, clara Fides genitrix.*

*Aurium aperta tibi cur altera, & altera clausa est?*

*Una patet justis, altera surda malis.*

Cur



Cur gladium tua dextra gerit? cur læva BILANCEM?

Ponderat hæc caussas, percutit ille REOS,

Cur sola incedis? Quia copia rara bonorum est;

Hæc referunt paucos secula Fabricios.

Paupere cur cultu? Semper justissimus esse

Qui cupit, immensas nemo parabit opes.

BUT to return to the Word *bilanx*, I must own the Word pleases me much, and strikes my Mind at first with the Image of a Ballance with two Scales, *libra cum duobus lancibus*; so that though no other Writer had used it formerly, I should have reckon'd it a Beauty, not a Blemish in Dr. *Johnston*, to have used it according to *Horace's Rule*, *Art. poet.* 47.

Dixeris egregiè notum si callida verbum

Reddiderit junctura novum. —

*Lanx* being a good Latin Word, and the Force of *bis* or *bi* well known in other compound Words; as, *Biceps*, *bi-corpor*, Cic. *Bidens*, *bicornis*, *bifrons*, Virg. *Bicolor*, Ovid. with innumerable others.

Having thus vindicated Dr. *Johnston* from all the Instances adduced by the Remarker against the Purity of his Stile, I conceive myself obliged, by way of Recrimination, though otherwise it is much contrary to my Inclination, to lay before *Philo-Buchananus* several Words and Phrases used by *Buchanan*, which may be with as great Justice excepted against, as those he censures in *Johnston*.

Some of these Words are, Continuo, *Psal.* xxviii. 9. *pro continenter*, assidue, usque, *barbarum esse contendit accuratissimus Jo. Ker, sel. de L. L. obs. lib. 2.* Rotatilis, *Pf.* cxlviii. 4. *Vox à poeta, ut videtur, novata.* Chytr. Veriloquus, *Pf.* lxxviii. 4. *Vocem hanc improbat Vossius de vit. L. L. iii. 54.* Protector, *Pf.* lxxi. 23. *Inferioris ævi vox.* Vid. *Cellarii curas posteriores*, & *Borrich, p. 206.* Coelitus, *Pf.* cxlix. 9. *posterioris ævi vox.* Vid. *Fabri Thes.* Somnolentia, *Pf.* xlv. 23. *vox priscis ignota.* Vid. *Steph. Thes.* Affluenter, *Pf.* xxv. 13. *vox non usitata ante Solinum.* Parturiit, *Pf.* vii. 14. *exemplum apud classicos nondum inveni, quanquam Buchananus noster Pf. vii. 14. adhibeat.* RUD. *Gram. maj. part. 1. p. 262.* Turturis tuæ, lxxiv. 19. *contra linguæ Latine consuetudinem turtur hic femininum posuit,* RUD. Pecus

Pecus destinata, *Pf.* xlv. 11. *Hujus vocis nominativus nusquam apud probatum auctorem jam reperitur, &c. Vid. Rudd. Gram. maj. part. 1. p. 131. Vossii Anal. i. 48. & Jo. Kerri sel. obs. de L. L. p. 2. in vocem pecudis.* Aufus, *Pf.* vii. 9. for *ausa*. Aufus, -us, *subst. Vox apud Jctos sola & sing. numero*; but *ausum, -i*, is the true classical Word for an Attempt. *Pedo*, *Pf.* xxiii. 4. Abl. from *pedum*, wants Authority, as *allo luis*, *Pf.* xxxv. 13. in the Genitive from *lues*. *Prudentius* uses *luis* in the Nominative, *Ham.* 249. *Sospitator*, *Pf.* li. 14. *Non in usu ante Apuleium.* *Multinodis*, *Pf.* x. 9. *Vox, quam finxisse Buchananum censet Chytraeus, non in usu ante Prudentium.* *Subrutus*, *Pf.* vi. 5. & cvi. 22. *pro obrutus, quod nunquam me vidisse fateor.* *Hunt.* *Omniparæ*, *Pf.* l. 4. *nullâ prorsus auctoritate nititur.* *Omniparens est vox quâ utuntur Lucret. & Virg.*

Some of the Phrases excepted against as wanting classical Authority are, *Peto te taurum*, *Pf.* l. 59. *Vid. Rudd. Gram. maj. part. 2. p. 169. Cum vulgato interprete Luc. xi. 11. patrem petit panem nolim dicere.* *Deum pangere præconiis*, *Pf.* xlvii. 1. *Nescio an auctore bono hanc locutionem adserere posset Buchananus, mihi nunquam lectam fateor.* *BUR.* No doubt *pangere laudes vel præconia Dei* may be very well supported by *pangere versus*, *Cic. carmina*, *Lucr. & poemata*, *Hor.* But whether *pangere Deum laudibus & præconiis* may be said is the Question. *Nostros præire exercitus*, *Pf.* lx. 10. *Huic quid audiam, cxix. 100. An audire alicui defendi possit vehementer dubito, certè ego nullum exemplum novi.* *BUR.* *Favor in Deum*, *Pf.* xlv. 22. *Durius haud dissimulo.* *HUNT.* *Ad instar*, *Pf.* xxii. 16. condemn'd by *Servius*, and used only by Writers of latter Ages. *Quale canebarum*, *Pf.* cxxxvii. 3. *pro qualia, insolens; pro qualiter durum.* *RUD.* *Obruti tot claudibus*, *Pf.* xlv. 17. *Supplendum licet simus, quod duriusculum.* *RUD.* *Nemo sit qui de manibus mihi prensa tollat*, *Pf.* l. 22. *pro prensos.*

The Remarker doth not make any Exceptions against *Johnston's* Versification, nor alledge any Escapes of his as to the Prosody: If he should, let him remember what Criticisms several learned Men have made on *Buchanan's* Versification, and the Liberties used by him, which he may see collected by the learned and indefatigably industrious *Mr. Thomas Ruddiman* in his Treatise *de metris Buchananæis*



*chananæis* cap. iii. where though he laudably attempts *Buchanan's* Vindication as far as possible, yet in the Quantity of some Words, such as the last in *uti*, p. 12. 6. he gives him up, and in others I much doubt if he fully satisfies himself more than others. I wish the Remarker would give Authority for *Buchanan's* using the middle Syllable in *salubris* short in that Choriambic Psalm xcix. 3.

*Nomen, qui salubri temperie modum.*

As to the Authority offered from *Helvius Cinna* in that Verse, *Hostica quod salubrem cuspis haberet opem*, it is a wrong reading, as is remarked on the Margin, for *celerem* which the Sense requires. *Buchanan* uses the last in *revocando* short, *Pf.* lxxxviii. 11. and lxxix. 8. which *J. Broukhusius* in his Notes on *Tibull. Eleg.* iii. 6. 3. will by no means allow.

I hope the candid Reader will readily excuse what I have just now produced concerning the great *Buchanan*, it being purely in Self-defence, and nowise with a View to lessen or detract from his immortal Name, for which none has a more sincere Honour than the Publisher. This he hopes will manifestly appear to all unprejudiced Persons who are pleased to look into his late Collection of *Poetarum Scotorum Musæ Sacræ*. Is it not obvious that one chief Design of the Publisher was to aggrandize *Buchanan*, and to vindicate only a second Place to *Johnston*? And hath he not contributed more to exalt *Buchanan's* justly applauded Fame, by printing in this Collection Dr. *Eglishem's Poeticum Duellum* with *Buchanan*, and other Poems relative to *Buchanan*, than the late Editors of *Buchanan's* Psalms have done in all their Notes? In short, what greater Honour was it possible for him to do to *Buchanan*, than to propose *Johnston* to be only *Buchanan's* PRÆCURSOR in the Grammar Schools? And in all the Exceptions made either against *Buchanan* or *Johnston*, my real Sentiments are that *Horace's* golden Rule should be observed. *Art. Poet.* 351.

*Verum ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis  
Offendar maculis, quas aut incuria fudit,  
Aut humana parum cavit natura.* —

The Remarker proceeds, p. 16. to compare *Buchanan* and *Johnston* as to the Simplicity and Easiness of Stile, and as to their Closeness to the *Hebrew*. As to the first, 'Tis not a fair Method to pick out some plain Passages of *Buchanan* and compare them  
with

with others of *Johnston*, for thus out of the obscurest Author that is some plain Sentences may be cull'd, and out of the plainest Authors some Sentences may be pick'd which, as standing by themselves, may appear somewhat obscure. And therefore though it were granted that in all the Instances adduced by the Remarker, *Buchanan* was as plain or plainer than *Johnston*, it will by no means follow that the whole of *Buchanan's* Paraphrase is plainer and easier than the whole of *Johnston's*. I perswade my self that any sufficient impartial Judge who will take the Trouble to compare any two or three Psalms of each together, will obviously perceive and frankly acknowledge, yea admire in *Johnston* his Perspicuity join'd with Brevity, as *Hoogstratan* very well observes in these Words, *Cum enim mirum in modum caperer felici poetandi ratione, quâ breviter & sine ullâ circuitione tantas res complexus est, non imminutâ sententiarum gravitate, legentiumque animum contra omnem satietatem & fastidium munivit.* Whereas, though in a great many Places *Buchanan* excels *Johnston* in a majestick Flow of Eloquence, it is the less to be wondred at, when compared with *Johnston's* Brevity; because *Buchanan*, using a Variety of Verses, frequently runs his Paraphrase out to a great length: Thus in the Instances adduced by the Remarker, *Buchanan*, *Psal.* xlv. has four Hexameter Verses, and a part of a fifth; whereas *Johnston* confines himself to one Elegiac Distich. So *Psal.* cxxix. 8. *Buchanan* hath four long Verses consisting of thirty two Words, *Johnston* only one Distich consisting but of eleven Words. The like is to be said of the Instance adduced *Psal.* cxxxii. 6.

As to that Pentameter, *Psal.* i. 1.

*Nec postica, tuum, sanna, sedile premit.*

I readily grant that the Order of this Line is not so obvious to a young Scholar, without the Assistance of a Master, and that if *Johnston's* Pentameters were all as difficult to resolve, I should be utterly against their being taught in Schools; but when it is considered, that in the whole Paraphrase you shall scarce find another Pentameter which hath such Difficulty, but a sweet Brevity, joined with a charming Perspicuity running through the whole, as was observed, this one Pentameter, and a few others, if any such be, should be justly overlooked with Wonder. But may not the Sense of this Pentameter be very well explained to Boys by their Masters, without

Ac-



Acquaintance with *Persius*? Do not other Authors use the Words *postica* and *sanna* as well as *Persius*? *Posticus*, *a*, *um*, is used by *Livy* 23. 8. *Hortus erat posticis adium partibus*. *Plin.* *Postica pars mundi*. *Hor.* 1 *Epist.* 5. 31. *Postico falle clientem*: *sup.* *Ostio*. *Sanna* is used by *Juvenal* and others, and *sannio* by *Cicero*. Must not young Scholars be acquainted with Words and Phrases by their Masters, Dictionaries and Vocabularies, before they read those more difficult Authors? And since our Schoolmasters are all so learned, as the Remarker will not allow a *crudus magistellus* amongst them all, no not in the *pagi rusticani* of all the 900 Parishes in *Scotland*; how easy is it for them to tell their Boys, That in this Verse there is an *Apostrophe*, a Figure neither unfrequent with the Poets, nor unbeautiful, *O postica sanna*, and that elegantly too, for *O postice sannio*, just as *Buchanan* uses *impietas*, *vis*, *nefas*, for *impius*, *violentus*, *nefarius*. *Buchanan* also uses the Word *postica*, (*Detect. Mariae*) but without a Substantive, which is not so justifiable as *Johnston's postica sanna*, *V. Rud. not. in loc.*

But is *Buchanan's* --- *Sessorve cathedra pestiferae facilem*, &c. so very plain? By no means; for here *sessorve* must be taken for *vel non sessor*, otherwise the *Scorner* would be here, by *Buchanan*, called *blessed*. I doubt if every one of the learned Schoolmasters adverts to this. But passing this first Verse, is all the rest of this first Psalm, most elegantly indeed translated by *Buchanan*, equally plain with *Johnston's* Paraphrase? Let us collate them a little. How softly and sweetly, how easily and smoothly do these Distichs of *Johnston's* flow, *Psal.* i. 3.

*Arboris in morem surget, felicibus auris*

*Quae viret ad ripam lene fluentis aquae.*

*Cui tempestivis curvantur brachia pomis,*

*Nullaque vernantes decutit aura comas.*

How must the young Scholar be pleased with these natural Images of verdant Trees blossoming on the Bank of a River, the purling Stream gently gliding by, and the Boughs of fruitful Trees, now ways blasted, weighed down with a Load of fine ripe Fruit.

*Buchanan* thus, with a lofty Majesty indeed, but not with such a natural Easiness,

*Ille, velut riguae quae margine consita ripae est*

*Arbor, erit: quam non violento Sirius aestu*

*Exurit, non torret hiems. sed prodigo leto  
Proventu beat agricolam: nec flore caduco  
Arridens, blanda Dominum spe lactat, inopem.*

Now a Master that would explain *Buchanan* to advantage to his Scholars, must be well acquainted with Astronomy, as well as *Kirgil* and others of the classick Authors, otherwise how will he explain *violento Sirius estu*, and *exurit, non torret hiems*.

How poetical and elegant are those Lines;

*Subito sed turbine rapti  
Pulveris instar exunt, volucris quem concita gyro  
Aura levis torquet vacuo ludibria celo.*

But are they so plain and easy to Boys of ten or twelve Years of Age, yea to Masters themselves, to render into any tolerable *English*? And whatever our Remarker may say, I am sure Gentlemen of Age, well skill'd in Letters, will acknowledge this.

Let any one impartially consider this whole first Psalm, as translated by *Buchanan* and *Johnston*, he'll obviously see that *Buchanan*, though very sublime and elegant, is not by far so plain and easy as *Johnston*. It may also be observed here, that our Scholars having been generally taught *Buchanan's* Paraphrase in the Schools, it is more familiar to them, and therefore they are not so sensible of the Difficulties thereof; whereas, if they had been first taught *Johnston's* Paraphrase, and not seen *Buchanan's*, the same would have appeared to them much more manifestly, when they happened to look into *Buchanan*.

If any one be not entirely satisfied from what is said, that *Johnston's* Paraphrase is generally more plain and easy than *Buchanan's*, let him seriously consider those Passages, as translated by *Buchanan*, *Psal.* v. 9. vii. 14. xvii. 11. the whole xviii. Psalm, the whole xlix. liii. i. lxvii. 64. with many others, and collate with them the same Passages as translated by *Johnston*.

As to the Comparison the Remarker institutes betwixt *Buchanan* and *Johnston's* Paraphrases, with respect to their closeness to the *Hebrew*; I don't know if either he or I be very good Judges in that Matter. He indeed mentions one *Hebrew Word*, *Rachash*, p. 19. which I am well informed, by the Assistance of a young Gentleman or two, he got explained to him from an *Hebrew Lexicon*; and yet how confidently doth the Remarker pretend to judge on this



this Head betwixt *Buchanan* and *Johnston*, in every one of the Passages of the *Psalms* he adduces to be compared, and boldly appeals to his Readers, if *Buchanan's* Paraphrase doth not excel *Johnston's* in closeness to the Original in each of the Passages adduced: At the same time he shows his Reader no Original to compare the two Paraphrases by, unless he mean the *English* Translation of each Verse, which he prefixes to them. He also very injuriously insinuates, p. 16. as if Dr. *Johnston* had neglected to consult the Original, and only copied after *Buchanan*; whereas, on the contrary, with the small Skill I have of the *Hebrew*, I can point out to him some Passages where *Johnston* appears to have well considered the Original, and *Buchanan* to have entirely overlookt it, or not duly weighed the same.

The first Passage I mention is, *Psal.* lxii. 10. *Ach hebel benei-adam, cazab benei-ish, &c. Engl.* "Surely men of low degree are vanity, and men of high degree are a lie: to be laid in the ballance, they are altogether lighter than vanity." Here all Interpreters, ancient and modern, *Jewish* and Christian, agree, that there is in this Verse in the *Hebrew* Text, a plain Distinction of Men into two Ranks, one of low, and another of high Degree. Which Distinction however is entirely overlookt by *Buchanan* in his Paraphrase, where he mentions only Men of high Rank, *Reges & principes.*

*Ventosa regum & principum potentia*

*Est vanitate vanior,*

*Adeoque fumo levior: ut si principum*

*Hac lance vires omnium,*

*Inanitatem hac colloques, cunctis simul*

*Inanitas præponderet.*

which is faithfully preserved by Dr. *Johnston*,

*Futile deprendes nimiumque volatile vulgus;*

*Estque paludati purpura vana chori.*

*Lancibus impositos trutina ventosque virosque;*

*Gens hominum certè plus levitatis habet.*

How beautifully doth *Johnston* here display the Elegance of the *Hebrew* *benei-adam* by *futile & volatile vulgus*, and of the *benei-ish*, by *paludati purpura chori*, with a noble and sublime Majesty? How well also doth he express the *Hebrew* Word *cazab*,

*mendacium*, by the Latin Word *vana*, which is elegantly used by the best Authors for *mendax*? so *vanus auctor*, Liv. xxix. 32. Virg. Æn. i. 396. vi. 80. x. 631. Then how well doth he express the Import of *jahad*, *simul*, *pariter*, in the last Clause of the Verse, by the general Expression *gens hominum*, comprehending both the *vulgus* and *purpurati*? So that the Sense of the Verse, as paraphrased by Dr. *Johnston*, I take to be this, *Men of low Rank are Vanity*, as little regarded as a laking Vessel, or Straw tossed with the Wind, having nothing in them to attract and engage others to trust and depend on them. *Great Men* (who make a splendid Figure in the World with their Power, Riches and Honours) are *a Lie*, i.e. they disappoint the Expectations of their Dependents. Yea, *all Men*, both small and great, are lighter than the Wind, and *altogether Vanity*.

If what is said doth not satisfy the Remarker, that *Johnston* had the Original more closely in View than *Buchanan*, let him consider a great Number of Passages where *Buchanan* uses great Liberty, not in the least founded on the *Hebrew*, such as these following.

Psal. xx. 1. *Cuncta licet ferro*, &c.

xxiii. 1. *Quid frustra rabidi*, &c.

xxv. 1. *Hic fidat armis*, &c.

xxxvi. 1. *Ut exta flammis*, &c.

xliv. 5. *Te dante vires---Taurus minaci---Stipuleve*, &c.

lxxiii. 1. *Tellus ut undis hospitium neget*, &c.

lxxxv. 1. *Non semper tumidis*, &c.

cxv. 1. *Te, magne rector orbis*, &c.

In all which Passages *Johnston* indulges himself in no such Liberty, but keeps close to the Original.

It may be further observed, that *Buchanan*, instead of keeping close to the *Hebrew* in several Passages, follows the Septuagint Version, or rather the Vulgate *Latin*, which for the most Part copies after the Septuagint; vid. Ruddimanni not. in psal. li. 12. Buch. *Spiritu principe*; LXX. πνεύματι ἡγεμονίᾳ; vulg. Lat. *Spiritu principali*. Vid. Jo. Kerri not. in voces Hebraicas Ammi & nadib, Cant. Sol. vii. 12. *Buchanan* also, Psal. xlv. 1. uses *eructant*, from the vulg. Lat. *Eructavit cor meum*; and the LXX. ἐκπνεύξατο ἡ καρδία μου, as we shall hear afterwards.

But since in this Point the Remarker, with great Assurance, states him-



himself in direct Opposition to the Sentiments of the celebrated Authors of the much approved *Universal History*, Vol. I. p. 710; whose Words are these, “ Those (Translations of *David's Psalms*) “ which have followed the Original closest, have succeeded best; “ such are in particular, the *Latin* ones of *Castalio*, *Buchanan* and “ *Johnston*; this last indeed the most literal, and wonderfully displays the Elegance of the Hebrew, &c.” I shall leave it to those learned Gentlemen to support their own Opinion against this new *Hebrew-Critick*; in the mean time I flatter myself, that their Authority will weigh more with all Persons of Judgment, than his Assertion to the contrary.

The Remarker tells us, p. 18. That it will be found no easy Matter to give good *English* for *Johnston's* Distich in *Psal.* cxxix. 8. This may be said with more Justice of the greater Part of *Buchanan's* Paraphrase, especially his Hexameters, and that without any Disparagement of *Buchanan*. I wish the Remarker would give us a Specimen of his Skill this Way, in translating but one of *Buchanan's* Psalms, such as the first or eighteenth, yea, a Verse or two only to try his Hand, such as *Psal.* i. 4.

————— *Subito sed turbine rapti*  
*Pulveris instar erunt, volucris quem concita gyro,*  
*Aura levis torquet vacua ludibria cælo.*

and *Psal.* xviii. 8.

*Fumeus afflatu de naribus æstus anhelos*  
*Undabat: rapidæ contorto vertice flammæ*  
*Ore fluunt, vivæque animant attacta favillæ.*

The Remarker, p. 19. institutes a Comparison betwixt *Buchanan's* Paraphrase and *Johnston's*, on *Psal.* xlv. i. BUCHANAN,  
*Cor micat, exsultant trepidis præcordia fibris,*  
*Eruçantque novum gravido de pectore carmen:*  
*Certat lingua animum fando, manus æmula linguam*  
*Scribendo exæquare, meo nova carmina Regi*  
*Dum cano.* ———

JOHNSTON,

*Dicere fert animus Regem, nova carmina Regi*  
*Lingua parat, calamo par erit illa levi.*

*Buchanan's* is certainly grand and majestick, and in this Respect preferable to *Johnston's*, which is soft and easy; but may it not be justly

justly thought, that this Difference chiefly arises from the Nature of the Verse in which each of them wrote, the one in Hexameters, which naturally carry Loftiness with them, the other in Elegiacs, which love to flow with a gentle Easiness? Now, I say, both *Buchanan* and *Johnston* here are most excellent, but each in his own kind of Verse, the one in Heroick, the other in Elegiac Numbers; and therefore it is not just to institute a Comparison betwixt *Buchanan* and *Johnston*, but where they both write the same kind of Verse. If *Johnston* had been to paraphrase this Verse in Hexameters, and that in the Length of four or five Lines, I shall not say he would have excelled *Buchanan*, though, I believe, it is probable he might have come pretty near him; yet this I'll say, that *Johnston* would have excelled himself, I mean, his Hexameters would, in Grandeur and Loftiness, have excelled his Elegiac Distich. On the other Hand, if *Buchanan* had been to paraphrase this Verse in one Elegiac Distich, I doubt if he could have done it much better, *i. e.* with greater Easiness and Softness, at the same time comprehending the whole Subject. How beautifully doth the Doctor paint the Mind, the Tongue, and the Pen of the divine Psalmist, all in their Course instantly acting their Part with joint Harmony! Who sees not the nimble Hand and fleet Quill of the Scribe, in the last Verse?

*Lingua parat, calamo par erit illa levi.*

On the other Hand, *Buchanan's* Diction here is most proper and elegant, I always admired it,

*Cor micat, exsultant trepidis præcordia fibris. —*

*Certat lingua animum fando, manus æmula linguam*

*Scribendo exæquare. —*

But not to dissemble, I never liked the Word *eructare* here in this divine *Epithalamium*, it always raised in me a certain shocking Idea, notwithstanding that the Vulgate *Latin* and some other Versions have it; and I dont remember that either *ructo* or *erueto* are used by the best Authors without some Note of Turpitude affixed. *Cic. Phil. ii. 25. Cui ructare turpe esset is vomuit. Cic. in Pis. Nos cum improbè respondendo, tum turpissimè eructando nos eiecisti.* Nor do the Remarkers raw Criticisms here (of which he is so full, that he belches them up *ad nauseam usque*) give me the least Ground to alter my Opinion. First he tells us, that *Buchanan's* *erueto* happily and properly expresses the Hebrew Word *na-*

*chash*



*ebullit* in this Verse here. In this I humbly differ from him. Those that have some Acquaintance with the *Hebrew* tell me, that *tachash* properly signifies *ebullire*, not *eructare*, a bubbling up as a Fountain, not a belching up Wind as an old Wife; which two Words represent two different Images. As to the Vulgate, and some other *Latin* Versions, which use the Word *eructat*, they follow the *Septuagint* Translation, not the original *Hebrew*; *vid. Schindleri Lexicon in vocem tachash*, *Buxtorf* and others; so that *Buchanan*, in the Use of this Word here, may be justly said to copy after the *Septuagint*, or rather the *Vulgate Latin*, not the *Hebrew*, as he doth in other Places, as was observed before. As for *ruclare versus*, which he says *Horace* uses, I never saw it, nor can I find it in any Edition of *Horace* which I have. He has indeed *ruclatur versus*, *Art. Poet.* 457. but *ruclto* the Active came nearer to the Remarker's beloved Word *erueto*, than *ruclor* the Deponent.

But the Remarker tells us, that *Janus Broukhusius*, in his Notes upon *Tibullus*; highly commends *Buchanan* for the Propriety and Elegance of his Diction here; so doth the Publisher, excepting as to the Word *erueto*. Ay, but he prefers *Buchanan* to all others who had attempted the same; so doth the Publisher too, and in particular to *Johnston*, as above. But doth *Janus Broukhusius*, in his Notes on *Tibullus*, expressly prefer *Buchanan* to *Johnston*, as some may be ready to think from the Remarker's Words? or is it plain from his Words that he had him in View? No indeed; all he says in his Note is, *El. I. xi. 12.* (which the Remarker thought fit to keep silent) *Præclare Buchananus*, *Psal. xlv. Cor micat, — non tam venè alii Poetæ, idem conati.* By the *alii Poetæ*, (for he doth not say *omnes alii*) it is probable, he means *Eobanus Hessus* and *Beza*, whom he mentions elsewhere in his Notes, and not *Johnston*, whom he nowhere mentions in all his Notes.

But have we no Evidence that *Janus Broukhusius* commended *Dr. Johnston's* Paraphrase? Yes indeed. If the Remarker had been pleased to look into the Testimonies of *Dr. Johnston*, published in any Collection, (which he, so much blinded to *Buchanan*, seems to wish were buried in eternal Silence) and if he has any Faith to give to *D. Hoogstratan*, he'll plainly see that *Broukhusius* was charmed with *Johnston's* neat Conciseness, and that he thought *Johnston's* Paraphrase most proper to be taught Youth, not only for the Elegance

gance of the *Latin*, but for forming their Minds with pious Sentiments. *Hoogstratan's* Words, in his Epistle to *Broukhufius*, are, *Captus sciz. concinnitate, quam ibi residere videbas, & satagens publica utilitatis, quæ exigit ut ingenua adolescentia non solum elegantiam Romani sermonis & eloquentiæ affectet, lectionique bonorum scriptorum assuescat— Sed etiam pietatem fideliter imbibat.* Is not here the learned *Broukhufius's* Authority for reading Dr. *Johnston's* Paraphrase in the Schools, which no Doubt will have far more Weight with the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, than all the Remarker's trifling Exceptions to the contrary.

The Remarker proceeds, p. 20. to except against some strange out of the way Words, as he calls them, used by *Johnston*; viz. *Typhus, seminium, lerna, combinans, sequestratum, segrex, pistrix, æviternus, nomenclatura.* How far just his Exceptions are, the intelligent Reader may judge by the following Authorities.

*Typhus pro superbiâ & mentis elatione*, is used by *Arnobius*; lib. ii. p. 53. *Vultis hominis istum typhum superciliumque deponere.* Ib. p. 63. *Typhum & arrogantiam frangere.* And frequently by *Augustin.* de civ. D. xi. 12. *Societas tumens typho, &c.*

*Seminium* is used by *Lucret.* III. 742. *Triste leonum seminium,* ibid. 746. & 764. *Plaut.* Amph. iv. 3. 15. *Anguineo seminio,* *Mil. Glor.* iv. 2. 68. *Varro de Re R.* ii. 3. de seminio dico eadem, Id. 2. 6. *E quo seminio procuravi pullos.* Ibid. *Bono seminio;* and by *Columella*, 2. 1. *Quo sunt seminio pecudes querendum.* Ibid. *Latentibus seminiis.*

As to the Lake *Lerna* and *Hydra* the *Lernean* Serpent slain by *Hercules*, what Boy at School is ignorant of the Story? Hath he not the *Pantheon*, or some such Book of Mythology, when he begins to read *Ovid's Met.* or *Virgil*, who repeat the Story so oft, *Met.* I. 597. ix. 69. 130, &c. *Æn.* vi. 387. *Bellua Lerna horrendum stridens.* Ibid. 804. viii. 300. xii. 518, &c. Why must he have Recourse to the Greek Authors, or *Erasmus's* *Chiliads*, to understand this Story? As to the Phrase, *Lerna malorum*, it is proverbial, and, in my Opinion, very significant, equivalent to *Cicero's Ilias malorum*, *Ep. ad Attic.* *Tanta malorum impendet ilias.* If after all the Remarker shall still think it not so proper to be used in a sacred Poem, I humbly conceive it may be allowed as well



well as *Eumenides*, or the *Furies* used by *Buchanan*, *Psal.* lxxviii. and some other Words and Phrases used by him elsewhere in his *Psalms*, *Cerealia munera*, *Olympus*, *Tartarus*, *Amphitrite*, *Phæbus*, *Stygia compede*, *Hymenæus*, *Astræa*, *Centimano Giganti*. What did the *Jews* know of the heathenish *Furies*, *Stygian Lake*, or *hundred banded Gyants*, &c.

*Combinans* is used by *Sidonius*, *Ep.* ix. 8. *Obsequia combinans numeris æquata non meritis*, and *August.* *conf.* 8. 6. *Forte combinati spatiabantur*.

*Sequestratus* is used by *Macrobius*, *Saturn.* vii. 11. *Sequestrata verecundia*. *Ammian.* xx. 7. *Sequestratæ sollicitudines bellicæ*. *Id.* xviii. 1. *Sequestrata ira*. *Veget.* II. 20. *Dimidia pars sequestraretur apud signa*. *Tertul.* de resur. *Corpora medicata condimentis sepulturæ Mausoleis & monumentis sequestrantur*.

*Segrex* is used by *Seneca de Ben.* iv. 18. *Segrege vita*. *Prudentius*, *Ham.* 803. *Segrege forma*. *Id.* 66. *Segrege regno*. *Id.* *Cath.* 7. 28. *Heliam segregem*. *Sidon.* *Ep.* 9. *Civitates situ segreges*.

*Pistrix* is frequently used by *Cicero* in *Arato* 178, &c. *Fera pistrix*, 140. *Neptunia pistrix*, 440. *Ceruleæ pistrice*, 275. *Flor.* III. 5. 16. *Marina pistrix*. *Germ.* *Cæsar.* *Squamigeræ pistris*.

*Æviternus*, *idem quod æternus*, *Varro de L. L.* 5. 2. *Id.* ap. *Prisc.* *Per æviternam hominum domum tellurem propero gradum*, *Ennius*, *Æviternum Jovem*. *Apul.* de *Deo Socratis*, p. 43 *Prorsus & retro æviterni Dii*.

*Nomenclatura* is used by *Pliny*, *præf. lib.* 3. *Nomenclatura mundi rerumque naturæ*. *Id.* II. 7. *Cælestem nomenclaturam*.

From the Authorities above adduced, the learned Reader may observe, that of all the above Words used by *Johnston*, excepted against by the Remarker, there is not any one of them entirely destitute of Authority; that some of them are used by the purest of the *Latin* Authors in the golden Age, *Varro*, *Columella* and *Cicero*, and that those few, which are not supported but by the Authority of later Ages, can be out-balanced by a far greater Number of such Words used by *Buchanan* himself, as we have observed above,

p. 13.

The Remarker at last in his penult Page comes to dispute the Truth of what I had advanced in my Preface to the Schoolmasters,

D

viz.

*viz.* That I had the concurring Sentiments of some respectful and learned Men, particularly Professor *Steuart*, Professor *Ker* and Mr. *Thomas Ruddiman* to support my Opinion on this Head; not indeed as the Remarker still most falsely and maliciously alledges, *That Johnston should be received into the Schools in ROOM of Buchanan*, but that *Johnston's* Paraphrase was in their Opinion proper to be taught in Schools BEFORE *Buchanan*, as being more plain and easy. This they unanimously did, do, and will declare to any who are doubtful of the Truth of it, to have been and yet to be their constant and fixed Opinion, even after they have read all the critical Remarks offered to the contrary And for uncontroverted Evidence of this Fact, because the Remarker is so great an Unbeliever in this Point, I have subjoin'd, in the Appendix, a true Copy of Mr. *Ruddiman's* joint Declaration with Professors *Steuart* and *Ker* of their Opinion on this Head, the Original whereof, subscribed by all their Hands, is in my Custody, which any who doubts may see. Now since Mr. *Ruddiman* hath given his Opinion for me, and that solemnly, first to the Committee of the General Assembly, and then under his own Hand-writing, I hope the Remarker and his Adherents, for whom he so confidently promises, will show that Regard to Mr. *Ruddiman's* Opinion he professes: But I'm afraid, notwithstanding of our new *Sumpsimus*, the Remarker (such is the Ingenuity of his Professions) will still cleave to his old *Mumpsimus*. After what is above said, it plainly appears how unjust, injurious and false it was in the Remarker to conclude his Letter thus, *That it is absolutely without Ground what the Publisher has so confidently asserted, that ever Mr. Ruddiman was of his Opinion in the Matter.* Here I think my self justly founded in an Action of Injures against the Remarker before the Commissaries, for such open Calumny and Defamation.

Before I conclude, I cannot but observe the Remarker's Conduct towards Professors *Steuart* and *Ker*: I am certainly informed neither of these Gentlemen ever gave him any just Offence, but on the contrary distinguished their Regard to him, and that, as some thought, too much. It might have therefore been expected, that in good Manners he should have acquainted those Gentlemen before he had published any thing on this Head, with respect to their Opinion and Performances, and before he had reprobated both their Testimonies.

As



As to Mr. *Steuart*, it is well known that besides his uncontested Skill in his own Profession, he has a very good Taste of the *Belles Lettres*, has a great many Years past been a generous Promoter of Learning, and every thing ingenious, for the Honour of his own Country, and has been particularly useful in giving proper Assistance from a good Collection of curious Books in his own private Library, which, amongst others, the late Editors of *Buchanan's Psalms* 1737 acknowledge. Notwithstanding all this, our Remarker is pleased to reprobate his Testimony and to tell us, *That he thinks the Schoolmasters are NOWAYS concerned to regard his Advice.* Yet I think the contrary, and am perswaded that a great many Schoolmasters through the Country will pay a greater Deference to Professor *Steuart*, their honest old Master, his Opinion, than to this new Dictator. As to his Hear-say Story about reading *Castalio* in the Schools, and that *Castalio* was an *Arminian*; It is not alledged that either Mr. *Ker* or Mr. *Ruddiman* said so, and as to Mr. *Steuart* he refuses it too, and wonders how it could be said by any Person that *Castalio* was an *Arminian*, since *Arminius* was only three Years old when *Castalio* died. Sure *Arminius* must needs have been a very young Author, if he broach'd Doctrines when three Years old. The picking up of this Hear-say Story, or any such, dropt by a Gentleman with Freedom, and clapping it into Print, is another Specimen of the Remarker's Temper and good Breeding.

Let us next consider his Reasons for reprobating Mr. *Ker's* Testimony; not the same, to be sure, which he offers against Mr. *Steuart*, since the *Latin* is Mr. *Ker's* particular Profession. *He was*, says he, *too much interested in the Affair that his Advice should be followed, as having undertaken for the Impression of Johnston, and having his own Paraphrase of the Song bound up with it, even in that Copy design'd for the Schools.* It is well known that Mr. *Ker's* Interest in this Matter is as little as Mr. *Steuart's* or Mr. *Ruddiman's*, he having proposed no more Advantage by it than these other Gentlemen, *viz.* nothing but the Satisfaction of doing Justice to the Memory and Performances of the justly admir'd Dr. *Johnston*, the learn'd and pious Mr. *Boyd* of *Trochrig*, and some others of their own Country, whose Works were like to be entirely buried at home, while they were printed

and reprinted abroad, and when Strangers were erecting Marble Busts and striking Medals in honour of some of them. But here I must acquaint the Reader, that for some time bygone, ever since all the Copies of Mr. *Ker's Canticum Solomonis* have been sold; Mr. *Ker* has been solicited by some eminent Schoolmasters who taught his Paraphrase, to cast off a second Impression thereof, which no doubt he could easily have done, and thereby might have made some small Gain to himself; yet he choosed rather generously to allow me any small Profit which could be made that way. But here I can with far greater Justice retort on the Remarker, that he was too much interested in the late Impression of *Buchanan's* Psalms, and has a good Number of Copies of the little Edition on his Hands as yet, that he was afraid that the teaching of *Johnston* in Schools might interfere with the Sale of his Copies for his own private Pocket. This touches his Copyhold. Hence all *Philo-Buchananus's* Zeal against Dr. *Johnston*; whence he had a better Title to have assumed the Name of *Philargyros* or *Philantos* than of *Philo-Buchananus*.

After this the Remarker proceeds, by several Innuendo's, to give an indirect Thrust, or, to use his own Words, a Side-blow at Mr. *Ker's* Paraphrase of *Canticum Solomonis*, as if it did not deserve a Reading, or at least a second Impression, &c. *With what View*, says he, *this was done, the Publisher best knows. If it was not design'd to be read, but offered as a Specimen of Mr. Ker's poetical Genius, the learned World knew that already, &c.* All which, if he had pleased, he might have spared, for several very good Reasons. Doth he not know that Mr. *Ker's* Paraphrase, when published, about fourteen Years ago, met with the general Approbation of the best Judges in his native Country and in *England* too, and was frankly received into a good many Schools in *Scotland*, without any further Recommendation indeed than what it carried with itself, some of which Schools were of greater Eminence than that of which the Remarker is the Head, and the Masters of as distinguished a Character both for Abilities and successful teaching of Youth as ever *Philo-Buchananus* can probably arrive at, although they never wrote Criticisms on *Buchanan* or Dr. *Johnston*. Mr. *Ker* could produce sufficient Vouchers of what I have said from Testimonies of learned Men both in *South* and *North Britain*, both in Prose and Verse,



Verse, which have been lying dormant by him these several Years past, and which I inclined to have published in my late Collection, had his Modesty allowed me. He was not so vain and fondly ambitious of Fame as *Philo-Buchananus* was, who HIMSELF published Testimonies of HIMSELF for his own Performances in Manuscript, before ever he had published them to the World, and that with the highest Encomiums of unusual Elegance and Learning. See *Patriot*, No. VI. *I send you a few Passages from a Pamphlet not yet published.* Since the Pamphlet was not then published, 'tis plain that either *Philo-Buchananus* himself, or, which is much the same, a Friend of his by his Allowance, was the Writer of this high Panegyrick. Here is indeed Triumphant before the Victory. But Boasting is more suitable when we put off, than what we put on our Armour.

But another Reason why he might have spared his *Innuendo's* concerning Mr. Ker's *Canticum*, is this, It is well known Mr. Ker, ever since he was acquainted with the Remarker, had been his very good Friend, yea, by warmly espousing his Interest, had disoblged some others. If he had any Criticisms on his Performances to offer, would it not have been more agreeable to all Rules, to have apprised his Friend of them, than thus in a publick Manner make this indirect Attack? Will not this give Ground to suspect, that he is fully resolved to renounce all Friendship with his Friend, without any Manner of Provocation so much as alledged? May not his Friend say, *Et tu quoque amice?*

Moreover, he who regrets the Decay of *Latin* Poetry those hundred Years past, might he not at least have commended Mr. Ker's Attempt to revive this decayed Exercise in his Native Country, although the Performance had not altogether pleased his nice Taste?

*Ut desint vires, tamen est laudanda voluntas.*  
I wish this new Critick would also mind that of the Poet,

*Carpere vel noli NOSTRA vel ede TUA.*

When I make a Comparison betwixt Dr. Johnston's Paraphrase and Mr. Ker's in my Preface, *Cum ob carminis elegantiam, siquidem post Jonstonianam paraphrasin aliarum omnium jure merito longe elegantissima habeatur*, he doth not fairly represent my Meaning in these Words; "he himself frankly tells us that it is better than "Mr. Ker's," by which abrupt Manner of speaking some Disrespect seems

seems to be carried along, which I did not in the least intend; and now he must allow me to explain myself a little more fully.

Some may like one Poet better than another without disesteeming either, just as some like *Virgil*, some *Horace*, according to their different Tastes, but esteem both; so that when I said, that, next to *Johnston*, I liked Mr. *Ker*'s Paraphrase better than any other I had seen, I meant no Disrespect, on the contrary, I have read and taught it with Pleasure. I like his Choriambics much; his Elegiacs are soft and easy. When one compares his second Chapter with *Johnston*'s second, where the Comparison only can be justly instituted, the same Kind of Verse being there used by both, he would be doubtful which to prefer; and, I'm well informed, some very good Judges have given the Preference to Mr. *Ker*'s. The Remarker may also observe, that with Respect to Closeness to the original *Hebrew*, I did not prefer *Johnston*'s to Mr. *Ker*'s; and I have good Ground to believe that the Preference on this Head is due to Mr. *Ker*. But this I submit to skilful *Hebreans*, particularly to the learned Authors of the celebrated *Universal History*, who esteem this a great Excellence in Paraphrases of the sacred Scriptures.

He next assures me with a dictatorial Air, (Methinks I see him shaking his *Ferula* over my Head!) that neither Dr. *Johnston*'s nor Mr. *Ker*'s Paraphrase of the *Song* will be taught by him or any Schoolmasters of his Acquaintance. Doth he not know that Mr. *Ruddiman*, besides the *Quarto* Edition of Dr. *Johnston*'s *Canticum* 1709, published soon after another Edition in *Duodecimo* for the Use of Schools, at the Importunity of some Schoolmasters? I have already told, that sometime bygone, since the Copies of Mr. *Ker*'s *Canticum* were all sold off, he has been solicited by some Schoolmasters, and those of Distinction too, to make a new Impression, and have promised to encourage it still; so that I can assure him on good Grounds, that both Dr. *Johnston*'s Paraphrase and Mr. *Ker*'s will be read in Schools, without any Recommendation indeed from Church Judicatories, (which was never asked, as appears by my Petition in the Appendix, though falsely affirmed by the Remarker, p. 2.) as they have been, whatever he or his Acquaintances do or can do; and I persuade myself they will both be read by Posterity with Approbation, when there shall be no Memorial of *Philo-Buchananus*'s critical Remarks.



As to his profane and scandalous Comparison of the Divine *Song of Songs*, with *Ovid de arte amandi*, and *de remedio amoris*, and that he and his Fellow Schoolmasters would teach the former for a sacred Lesson (*absit blasphemia!*) no more than the latter, is most surprizing, nay shocking, not dropping rashly from the Mouth, but deliberately from the Pen of a Christian Institutor of Youth. How bold is he to pour such Contempt on any Part of the sacred Canon? The present Age abounds too much with Infidelity already, and wants to have bad Principles corrected in their Youth, not instilled into them by their Masters. Ay! but he has a *Salvo* for this, *I'm far from comparing that Divine Poem with any humane Composition*. But by this he doth not mend the Matter; 'tis just as if I should rudely break one's Head, without the least Provocation, and then say to him, I ask you Pardon, Sir, I did not design to break your Head: So after he has compared *Solomon's* Divine Song, with *Ovid's* profane lascivious Pieces, he tells you, indeed I have not compared them. Perhaps he will have another Evasion, and say, 'tis not *Solomon's* Song, but *Johnston's* and *Ker's* Paraphrases I compare with *Ovid's* loose Pieces; but this makes nothing for his Purpose either; for it is the Subject of *Solomon's* Song paraphrased by *Johnston* and *Ker*, and the Subject of *Ovid de arte amandi* and *de remedio amoris*, not the Language which is spoken of in the above instituted Comparison. Surely for Language he might as well read *Ovid de arte amandi* and *de remedio amoris*, as *Ovid's Epistles*, and that too for the Subject in some of them. Ay! but he tells you, That he and his Party have good Reason for it, from the Custom of the ancient *Jewish* Church, not allowing any under thirty Years of Age to read the Song. But are Christians now tied to every Law or Custom of the *Jews*? No surely. And if he be for a Prohibition taking place against reading *Solomon's* Song in *Latin*, why should he not be against reading it in *English* too? Why should he suffer his Children to make use of a Bible in which the *English* Song is, till they be thirty Years old? So that we must have two Sets of Bibles, one for those below, and another for those above thirty. And if this zealous Reformer once began this Piece of Reformation, and furnished us with an *Index expurgatorius* of the *Holy Scriptures*, I'm afraid he would not stop there. Why might not the Divine *Epithalamium*, *Psal.* xlv. and a great many Passages both of the old

Old and New Testament; such as, *Isa.* liv. and lxi. 10. *Jer.* iii. *Ezek.* xvi. *Hof.* iii. *Matth.* xxii. *Joh.* iii. 29. 2 *Cor.* xi. *Ephes.* v. 23. *Rev.* 19. 7. xxi. 2. and xxii. 17. with many others, be all expunged the Sacred Cannon, as containing a similar Subject with *Solomon's Song*, not fit to be read by those under thirty. All this I most humbly submit to the Reverend Judicatories of the Church, and doubt not but they will take care to inflict condign Censures on this Delinquent, and not suffer Teachers of Youth to propagate such corrupt and dangerous Principles, to the Dishonour of God and his Church. I hope therefore his own Kirk-session will take Notice of him in the first Place, and lay the Matter before the Presbytery of the Bounds. 'Tis enough for me that I insist against him before the Civil Judges, as I said, for open Calumny and Defamation. I am sure, if the Remarker lived within the Synod of *Aberdeen*, who gave Mr. Ker publick Thanks for his Performance on the *Song of Songs*, he would not pass without Censure for this Contempt thrown upon a Part of the Sacred Canon.

What follows in this last Paragraph with respect to Mr. *Ruddiman's* Usefulness in promoting Letters in his native Country, I most frankly and cheerfully agree to. But this honest Gentleman, for whom he professes such Regard, must not pass without an *Innuendo* more than Professors *Steuart* and *Ker*, viz. *Although he believed him to be of a contrary Opinion to the Publisher, yet he thinks that possibly he could connive a little, and countenance him in private, so as to get his thousand Copies of Johnston sold off.* An Insinuation, I'm persuaded no Man but one of the Remarker's Complexion would presume to make.

And thus, I hope, I have to the Conviction of the candid Reader, fully vindicated Dr. *Johnston* from all the Exceptions offered against him by the Remarker, as also Professors *Steuart* and *Ker* from the unjust and uncivil Exceptions made against them. What now remains, is to vindicate my self from the injurious Calumnies cast upon me in the first twelve Pages of his scurrilous Letter; which shall, I hope, shortly meet with proper Answers. And this shall suffice at present from *Philo-Jonstonus*, and *Philo-Buchananius* too in Sincerity, but much more,

PHILALETHES.

APPEND



## APPENDIX

## NUMB. I.

Edinburgh, May 19th, 1740.

To the Venerable Assembly of the Church of Scotland,

The PETITION of *William Lauder* Teacher of Humanity in  
*Edinburgh*,*Humbly sheweth,*

**T**HAT your Petitioner having, with his utmost Care and Diligence, with the Advice and Assistance of several Persons of Learning in the Place, namely Mr. *Robert Stewart* Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of *Edinburgh*, Mr. *John Ker* Professor of Humanity there, Mr. *Thomas Ruddiman* Keeper of the Lawyers Library at *Edinburgh*, and others, prepared a most beautiful and correct Edition of Dr. *Arthur Johnston's* Paraphrase of the Psalms of *David* in *Latin* Verse, together with the late Reverend and Learned Mr. *Robert Boyd* of *Trochrig*, sometime one of the Ministers of this Church, and formerly Principal of the University of this City, a Person eminent both for his Skill in Divinity and Poetry, his *Heed-tombe Christiana*, or a Poem comprehending, in a Century of Sapphic Stanza's, almost the whole Sum and Substance of Christian Religion, (which Poem used formerly to be taught in the publick Grammar-schools of this Kingdom) together with some other Poems in *Latin* Verse also on sacred Subjects: And your Petitioner being credibly informed, that the foresaid Paraphrase of the Psalms of *David* in *Latin* Verse, by our celebrated Countryman Dr. *Johnston*, is taught all *Holland* over, both in Schools and Universities there, your Petitioner therefore is humbly of Opinion, that the Doctor's Paraphrase deserves the Honour of being taught publickly in the Grammar-schools of this the Author's Native Country, as a sacred Lesson, as well as abroad; and your Petitioner is still the more induced to think so, as the Transition immediately from the easy Prose of *Castalio's* sacred Dialogues, to the difficult Verse of our great Countryman *George Buchanan* his incomparable Paraphrase of the Psalms; seems both too great and sudden at once to be intirely approved of, which yet has been the common Practice of most Schools in this Kingdom hitherto: Wherefore your Petitioner, in all Humility, presumes to propose, and refer it to the serious Consideration of the

Venerable Assembly, if it may not be worth while to appoint a Committee of some Reverend Members to converse with the Gentlemen above mentioned, about the Expediency of teaching Dr. *Johnston's* Paraphrase of the Psalms, together with the Reverend Mr. *Boyd* of *Trockrig* his *Hecatombe Christiana*, as a sacred Lesson in the Schools of this Kingdom; no Translator hardly whatever having done more Justice to that sacred Book of the Psalms, by faithfully exhibiting the true Sense and Elegancy of the original *Hebrew*, and that too without either adding to, or detracting from the sacred Text, or yet putting his own Glosses and Interpretations on difficult or ambiguous Passages, than Dr. *Johnston*; which extraordinary Character is bestowed on the Doctor's Translation by the very Learned and Judicious Authors of the *Universal History*, as may be seen either in that Book itself, or in the Quotation faithfully excerpted out of it, and prefixed, amongst several other Testimonies and Vouchers of our Author's singular Merit, to the Edition of the Doctor's Paraphrase of the Psalms published by your Petitioner; but more especially, as no other Book whatever is either better calculated for infusing proper Sentiments of true Christian Piety into the tender Minds of studious Youth, than the Psalms of that holy King and Prophet *David*, as containing a Compend of all Religion, and beautifully and faithfully exhibited in *Latin* Verse by our Author; and likewise, as no Book can be better suited for paving an easy Way, for a full and perfect Understanding of *Buchanan's* more masterly and sublime but difficult Performance, than it; which very End seems to have been, if not the only, yet one of the principal Motives which induced the Doctor to labour on that Subject, (as he is pleased to inform us himself in his prefatory Poem to the Reader) in which he has succeeded almost to Admiration.

*May it therefore please the Venerable Assembly, to appoint a Committee to enquire more seriously into the above Proposition, and to enjoin the Committee afterwards to report to the Commission their Sentiments thereanent; and in case the Committee and Commission their being, after due Deliberation, satisfied with the Reasonableness of the Proposal, to authorise the Commission immediately to grant a Recommendation, for teaching the Doctor's Paraphrase, to all the Schoolmasters within the Kingdom, who shall think fit to use the same, for which Recommendation Precedents are not wanting in this Church in similar Cases.*

According to Justice, and your Petitioner shall ever pray, &c.

WILLIAM LAUDER.

That the above is a just Copy of the Petition given in by Mr. *Lauder* to the late General Assembly, which is now lying in their Clerk's Hands, is attested by

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

NUMB



## N U M B E R II

*MINUTE of the General Assembly upon the above Petition.*

*Edinburgh, May 19th, 1740.*  
**U**PON the Petition of Mr. *William Lauder*, Teacher of Humanity in *Edinburgh*, who has prepared a correct Edition of Dr. *Arthur Johnston's* Paraphrase of the Psalms of *David* in *Latin* Verse, together with Mr. *Robert Boyd*, sometime Principal of the University of *Edinburgh*, his *Hecatombe Christiana*, and some other Poems on sacred Subjects, and craving the Churches Recommendation for having that Book taught in Schools: The Assembly nominated the Moderator, Masters *Alexander MacLagan*, *John Orr*, *James Mercer*, Principal *Chalmers*, Principal *Campbell*, Principal *Tullideph*, Professors *Gowdie*, *Lumsden* and *Cumins*, *John Hunter* and *James Ramsay* Ministers, Lord *Napier*, Mr. *John Steuart*, and Mr. *Albert Monro*, Ruling-elders, as a Committee to meet and enquire into the above Proposition, and report to the Commission their Opinion thereupon.

*Extracted from the Records of the General Assembly by*

**ROBERT MACKINTOSH.**

## N U M B. III.

*REPORT of the Committee of the General Assembly to the Commission.*

**A** Petition having been presented to the late General Assembly by Mr. *William Lauder* Teacher of Humanity in *Edinburgh*, craving, That Dr. *Arthur Johnston's Latin* Paraphrase of the Psalms of *David*, and Mr. *Robert Boyd of Trochrig* his *Hecatombe Christiana*, may be recommended to be taught in all Grammar-schools; the Assembly did appoint a Committee of their Number to take the Desire of the said Petition into their Consideration, and report to the Commission: And the said Committee having considered the same, give it as our Opinion, that the Commission should grant the Desire of the said Petition, and recommend the said Dr. *Johnston's* Translation as a good intermediate sacred Lesson in the Schools betwixt *Castalius's Latin* Dialogues and *Buchanan's* Paraphrase.

( 136 )  
N U M B U R ,

DECLARATION of Mr. Robert Stuart, &c.

WE hereto subscribing, Mr. Robert Stuart Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh; Mr. John Ker Professor of Humanity there, and Mr. Thomas Ruddiman Keeper of the Advocates Library, hereby declare, That we gave it as our Opinion to Mr. William Lauder, that Dr. Johnston's Latin Paraphrase of the Psalms is proper to be taught as a sacred Lesson in the lower Classes in Grammar-schools, previously to the reading of Buchanan in the upper Classes, as being more plain and easy: Which Declaration we two last named made to the Committee of the late General Assembly.



ROBERT STEUART,  
JO. KER,  
THO. RUDDIMAN.

P O S T S C R I P T.

IT is hoped that the Very Reverend Commission will show some Regard to the Opinion of those three Gentlemen mentioned in the above Certificate, since it was not spontaneously offered, but asked of them by the Committee of the last General Assembly, as also to the Opinion of the most Celebrated Authors of the Universal History, and to the Opinion of two most learned modern Critics, Janus Broukhussius and David Hoogstratanus, who plainly affirm Dr. Johnston's Latin Paraphrase of the Psalms proper to be taught Youth, both for the Elegance of the Language and Subject Matter, fit to form the Minds of Youth with pious Sentiments: And therefore it is humbly expected the Very Reverend Commission will approve of the Report of the Committee of the General Assembly.

F I N I S.

CMUT